1:4

e.t.s.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

journal

the e.t.s. journal

Vol. I, No. 4 April, 1955

CONTENTS

Editor's Page..... 3

Werner Merten, Ph.D.
Freedom and/or Discipline..... 5

Ronald S. Fitts
Are Seminaries Religious?..... 10

Edward Tulis
The Basic Stipend Plan..... 15

The Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks
Some Reflections on Bethel..... 21

The Rev. Frederic C. Lawrence
Letter to the Editor..... 25

* * * * * *

Editorial Board: Myron B. Bloy, Jr., Chmn.; Alexander B lair, Treas.; William E. Foley, Prom.; Prof. Joseph F. Fletcher; J.C. Michael Allen; Brian Kelley.
Art Department: Marilyn Foley

With this issue of the Journal, we end our first academic year of publication. This is the last issue which three members of the original staff, Tony Morley, Jane Morley, and Jake Viverette, will "see through the works." We will feel their loss. And, with this issue, Mike Allen, Alex Blair, and Brian Kelley begin their work as members of the Editorial Board. This, then, is the time for taking stock — for looking back over the ground we've covered, for seeing where we stand now, and for planning the coming year's policies.

From our point of view (admittedly prejudiced) the ground we have covered since our first editorial meeting last fall is immense. Editorial, publication, circulation, and financial crises have been faced and solved with every issue, but each crisis passed was ground gained. Editorially we have tried to be flexible while sticking closely to our original purpose — "the effective presentation of non-scholarly opinion of, by, and for the members of this immediate community"; in keeping with this policy, twenty-five members of our community have written on as many different subjects for the Journal. Our publication has become "slicker" with each issue. Our circulation has increased and we have paid our own way. We feel that under Tony Morley's leadership the Journal has, in fact, taken hold.

But in order to stay healthy we realize that we have to keep learning and growing and that we have to reamin closely dependent on the E.T.S. community. With the continuing suggestions, criticisms, and literary contributions from the community we hope to capitalize next year on the solid start which we have made this year.

Freedom and/or Discipline

By Dr. Werner Merten

It certainly is fascinating for any European student who has been granted a scholarship in the U.S.A. to live for one year in a community of theological students of another denomination and nationality than his own. Many problems arise during a stay in this country, and a European student lives in a kaleidoscope of constantly changing insights into all fields of life. It seems to me worthwhile to select one major problem out of the many before us — the problem of theological training in the U.S.A. and in Germany today.

Any impartial observer notices immediately a considerable difference in the course of study. The general distinction between American and German secular education plays an important part in this respect. A recent article by Hans Thierbach, entitled "American and Russian Education of Youth" (Die Zeit, 1954, No. 49), gives a good sketch of the character of American education. Avoiding superficial slogans — which only over-simplify and poison public opinion — Thierbach shows convincingly the emphasis in American education is on practical information which can be used in everyday life. Nobody today would question whether young Americans should learn how to drive before they undertake Greek and Latin. Rather the opposite is true in regard to young Germans, even today.

Applying this fundamental observation to our special problem of theological education, we must say at the outset that theological education in the U.S.A. generally displays the same characteristics as American secular education. In comparing German and American theological study, we soon conclude

that German study is non-directive, rather free, and 'loose', while American study seems directive, controlled, and rather strict. And yet, it would be no doubt an inadmissible simplification to characterize the German system of theological study as simply free, and the American system as rigidly controlled. Elements of both freedom and discipline in the academic realm exist in the German as well as in the American system. What can hardly be denied, however, is that the element of freedom predominates in the German system and the element of discipline in the American.

In this connection we must bear in mind that the chronological progression of German theological study is widely different from that in this country. Coming from college, the American theological student usually obtains his training almost exclusively from the graduate school of a specific denomination. His special study of theology is concentrated within a three-year span. Because the time is so limited, it is perhaps understandable that from the day of matriculation the student must thread his way through a labyrinth of requirements, reading assignments, deadlines, hour-tests, and course exams.

In striking contrast to this procedure, the German theological student normally begins with no fewer than eight semesters of rather theoretical study at any university with a theological faculty. On completing this time at the university by passing his First Theological Examination, he serves as vicar in a parish of his Church for half a year. Finally, he concludes his academic training by attending one of the denominational seminaries for two further years. At the close of this time, if he passes his Second Theological Examination, he may be ordained in his Church. It scarcely needs saying that with six-and-a-half years at his disposal, the German student has opportunity both to deepen his studies at certain points, and to waste some time at the beginning in dis-

covering just where he wants that concentration to be.

Bearing in mind these differences between American and German theological training, we may readily appreciate the differences between their typical products. On the one side — to speak in rather extreme terms — is the German ministerial type, characterized by his appearance as 'a theorizing scholar in the pulpit',not overly concerned with 'practical every-day problems of life'. On the other side there is the American ministerial type, characterized by his appearance as 'the well-versed manager of a widespread parish apparatus', skilfully organizing myriad clubs and committees, but not overly concerned with 'repellent doctrinal technicalities'.

In practice, of course, we shall find no one minister to represent either of these types in chemically pure form. Yet they point by exaggeration to very real differences. Would it not be fruitful to produce a better-balanced and more dynamic combination of these types than is generally found in either Germany or America? In any one minister we might properly hope for substantial penetration of his scholarly weaknesses by his pastoral strengths, and vice versa. I hope it is in just this respect that I— as a product of German training — am most profiting by my studies at E.T.S.

At this point a word about community life is appropriate. In any academic community, and especially in the life of any religious academic community, there exist 'problems'. German theological students seem somehow to have considerable difficulty in climbing down from 'abstract theological high-pressure areas' to a warm atmosphere of 'plain community life'. Perhaps this simply reflects the inordinate distance in Germany generally between theorizing about life and applying theory to life.

Be that as it may, any German student at E.T.S. must immediately notice a far greater expenditure of effort upon the achievement and realization of community than he has ever known at home. Even the relatively large number of students and students' wives (!) at E.T.S. does not prevent the attainment of real community life.

Speaking in terms of freedom and discipline in theological education, we may say that the striking predominance of freedom in German academic study tends unfortunately to foster an individualism which prevents genuine community life. Likewise we may argue that the ever-present framework of external discipline in American academic study encourages the high amount of inner discipline which is indispensable for any lively community. Paradoxically, however, any strict application of discipline in the form of assignments and hour-tests may hamper community life considerably. In the shadow of a deadline, there just is not time for fellowship. This could be a real and present danger, not only at E.T.S., but throughout American education.

Speaking of freedom and discipline leads me finally to the subject of field work. Of course we may not overlook or deny the weaknesses of any field-work program, as David Flanders has made clear (E.T.S. Journal, Vol. 1, No. 3). But no German student can do other than appreciate the true value of American field work, which represents to him a necessary and fortunate balance with the rather abstract theory of studies during the week. In Germany, to be sure, he has opportunity for full-time field work during the half year which he serves as vicar in a parish. But this can be no real balance to his studies since it does not run parallel with them. It is not so much a part of his training as an interreuption within it. Moreover, the supervision of student vicars by the rectors to whom they are assigned has always proved a problem in Germany, as well as here. More careful selection of fit rectors by Church authorities seems

in both countries to be the only way of improving the situation. On the whole, though, the constant involvement of students in field work is another commendable illustration of the American emphasis on discipline. It has no real counterpart in the more loosely organized German system.

In summary, let us speak at the level of principles. We certainly can learn from each other in a fruitful way. In this respect it is a pity that more American students are not able to study under the conditions in Germany, in the way that so many Germans can study in this country. At least one of the chief barriers, that of language, should be removed as soon as possible. The strictly directed system of study in America ought to extend its strictness to require more knowledge of foreign languages. If this rather practical proposal could be realized in American education, the doors of European universities and graduate schools would not stand open to American students in vain. More and more American theological students could experience directly the 'dangerous' and yet so creative freedom of European study, just as European theological students may now learn from American ways by bravely entering the dense net of daily requirements and deadlines in its hardship as well as its value. There is no doubting that neither of these two systems is ideal or perfect. Any real decision as to which is more adequate will rest finally upon the responsibility of the individual student, and his own way of study. Just for this reason, however, it is necessary that the student experience both systems, and, if possible, at their sources. In this experience lies the true and most important value of any exchange program and of my study at E.T.S. in particular. Meine Kollegen, vielen Dank!

Are Seminaries Religious?

By Ronald Sheldon Fitts

If one has been alert during recent weeks, he has heard in the course of the table talk in the refectory, in the resolution of the world's problems in the upper regions of Lawrence Hall, and in the world-shaking bull sessions continually held in the Common Room, no little discussion concerning the perennial problem confronting men in seminary — the training and development of the spiritual life over and against the intellectual life. This problem appears to be of primary concern to many of the newer members of the community who as yet have not come to see the unity and continuity of seminary life as have most of the old guard. As one who has wrestled with this problem as well as having been in another seminary of our Church where this problem was considered paramount, I feel somewhat qualified to offer a few pointers and suggestions that may help to clarify our thinking along these lines and help us to understand more fully the nature of the preparation we are receiving during our all too short stay here at E.T.S.

I believe that we can begin with the aspect of the problem that needs very little discussion and clarification, before moving on to the more important aspect. Let us start with the intellectual life. The complaint is often heard that seminary places too much emphasis on the intellectual development and training to the neglect of the spiritual and devotional training, which training must present a necessary supplement to all academic endeavors. Before we can justify or attack this sweeping, over-simplified, generalization, we must take into account some other important factors. First, our seminaries, especially this institution, have long traditions of high intellectual attainments resulting from correspondingly high academic standards and requirements for both admission and graduation. In order to insure future attain-

ments and carry on these traditions, the institutions must insist on maintaining these high standards and requirements. Consider the situation here at E.T.S. Most students who select this school for their preparation for the sacred ministry are fully cognisant of the standards and requirements prior to making application and, in many cases, the selection of this school is based solely on this tradition of high standards and requirements.

Second, in only three short years, we must acquire all of the grist that will go into the mill of our ministries for the rest of our lives. Never again will we have the opportunity for such concnetrated and directed study as these three years allow. If some of us doubt this fact, we have only to talk with men out in the field who regret that they did not take fuller advantage of the opportunity for study and reading that only the seminary situation can afford. I believe we must be realistic and face up to the fact that, just as in other graduate and professional fields of study, there is a necessary amount of given knowledge that must be absorbed in a relatively short period of time. For this reason, and this reason alone, the majority of the courses are of the nature of survey courses with everyone concerned realizing the impossibility of carrying out an exhaustive program of study in any given area. Study is a necessary part of any ministry that is to be something more than mediocre. If this is not so, we will not be doing much preaching or teaching after we take leave of this institution. With this in mind, the heavy course loads and course requirements should not prove a discouraging factor, but rather pointers for further study and learning. The foundation is being laid here that will be built upon in the many years to come. Our ministry does not begin three years hence, it begins now. The attitudes and habits that are being formed now will be carried away from here out into life and out into our life s work. This is just as true

for the study and intellectual habits as for the spiritual and devotional. A clergyman friend of mine, for whom I have the greatest respect, informed me that in recent years he has come to draw more and more on the basic principles of Biblical criticism in his parish work. When told that there was a basic disagreement between the scientific and the Biblical accounts of the creation of the world, the minister countered with "which story of creation in the Bible are you referring to?"

By way of summary: our fundamental purpose for being here at this school is not primarily to acquire spiritual perfection which can only come by the means of time and experience, but rather to learn the tools and techniques, the "given" material to assure a productive, fruitful ministry in a world that is rapidly becoming more complex and post-Christian. The pressing need is for clergymen and religious experience, but, more than this, the real need is for a highly educated clergy and competent leadership.

Now that these fundamental considerations are out of the way, we are prepared to turn our attention to the spiritual aspect of seminary training. This is the part of our training and development that many of us think is sadly neglected or possibly absent altogether. I believe that most of the difficulty here is found in a confusion and serious obscurantism as to just what the meaning of the spiritual life is. I say this because of the constant differentiation made in all the various "bull-sessions" between the intellectual as over and against the spiritual. Spiritual development is not something that we can acquire in the same manner that we acquire the "given" material of Systematic Theology or Church History. It can not be implanted in our consciousness by any method of pedagogy but only through divine activity as God draws us nearer and nearer and allows us to progress to a deeper knowledge and understanding of His eternal Presence. This is accomplished in many ways dependent

on our "degree of receptiveness" to grasp, in all of its ramifications and implications, the awareness of the Presence of God. Now this progress takes place in the classroom as we study and examine the Holy Word of God just as much as in St. John's Chapel or in any of our periods of private devotion and meditation. We are not going to achieve immediate spiritual growth or devotional development by any occasional appearance at one of the Daily Offices. But they are provided as an aid, guide, and help in our spiritual growth and development which is, in reality, the development of an attitude of awareness and realization of the Presence of God so that at all times and in all conditions, we find God everywhere. In this sense then, are not even our classes an act of devotion? Our lives being dedicated, all of our actions are consecrated. In like manner, will not all of our counseling, calling, study and preaching be devotional acts in the true sense of the word? Likewise, are not all of our actions here at seminary devotional acts? Is not our mere being here an act of devotion? As I mentioned previously, our ministry does not begin three years hence, it begins here, it begins right now. If the monastic can "pick up a straw for the love of God", we certainly can pursue our studies for the love of God. Perhaps, then we will begin to find God in the classroom, in the Common Room, in the refectory, as well as in our Chapel.

If I have succeeded in accomplishing anything in this brief article, my hope is that perhaps we will all come to see that there is really no difference between the intellectual and the spiritual, either here in seminary or later on in our various ministries. They are one because as Dr. Paul Tillich said, "For the truly religious person, there is no secular." This is merely a modern re-statement of the age-old profound truth that "if you can not find God everywhere, you can not find Him

anywhere." At all times, in all conditions, we find God everywhere. The more religious the secular becomes, the further we have progressed in the development of the spiritual life. In conclusion, as one of our professors has pointed out, the most important and meaningful thing is not the 'practice' of the presence of God as such, but rather, the recognition and awareness of God in the now as the Eternal Moment.

The Basic Stipend Plan

By Ted Tulis

One hot issue in church circles today is the Basic Stipend Plan. This is a plan designed to eliminate the problems of unequal clergy salaries and meager results for the amount of money spent in this channel.

In brief, the Basic Stipend Plan provides that to pay clergy salaries each church be assessed a certain percentage of its annual income. This assessment would be paid to the diocesan office and then be distributed according to a plan approved by the diocesan convention. The clergy would be paid on an equal scale making allowances for locality, number of dependents, and years of service. The plan is illustrated by the following case histories.

In the Diocese of Michigan in 1945 a committee on clergy salaries, made up of laymen of the Department of Finance, issued a report which presents the problems with the present salary scheme. The report showed that the diocese was losing valuable younger clergy to other dioceses because of the low salaries it paid. It was frequently difficult to attract younger clergy to the diocese for the same reason. The report called for an annual review by vestries of the salaries they are paying their clergy. It pointed out that a rector is expected to maintain a standard of living comparable to the community in which he lives, that he must be able to afford to buy literature and attend summer courses, that he must have adequate funds for the entertainment requirements placed on him, and that there is a vast difference in living expenses and upkeep between urban and rural parishes. The committee believed

that when vestries increase parish activities they overlook the rector's salary. The report recommended that the bishop appoint a committee of three laymen as a council of advice with him on this very important question.

The committee which was appointed submitted a report in 1946 recommending the adoption by the diocese of the Basic Stipend Plan. The report said:

> "We doubt that any intelligent man who might be given the task of spending a quarter of a million dollars annually on the spread of Christianity in the diocese...would create the present salary structure."

The report recommended that the diocesan office receive all salary appropriations from all parishes and missions and distribute the money as salaries on the following basis:

a single man.....$2100 a year and living quarters

a married man.....$2640 a year and a house, with $300 additional for each child under 18 and $200 additional for each five years of service. Note that this scale was recommended in 1946. The committee recognized that living costs vary according to local situations, but it believed that the larger fees and gifts coming to clergy in the more expensive communities would tend to offset these inequalities.

If the plan were adopted 58 of the 80 clergy salaries in the diocese would be increased an average $900 and 22 of the 80 salaries would be reduced an average $1250. One man would receive $2240 more than his present salary and one would receive $3860 less.

The committee's first objective was to provide a fuller, more secure life for three quarters of the clergy and their families. It stated that its second and equally important objective was to remove material

barriers, reduce rivalries, and enrich the fellowship within the clerical group. It felt that the plan had spiritual purposes and possibilities that would be defeated if evasions, no matter how apparently legitimate, were sought. The committee was realistic enough to recognize that it was unlikely that the plan would be adopted in letter or spirit without the impetus of those clergymen who salaries would be most drastically reduced. May I say that this proved all too true.

The report found support at the diocesan convention, but after some discussion it was referred to another committee for further study. In 1947 this committee made a majority report and a minority report.

According to the majority report the committee felt that the Basic Stipend Plan would accomplish the first objective, but it thought the second objective would be better fostered by men voluntarily taking a definite responsibility for the welfare of their brothers rather than by an arbitrary plan. It felt that the diocesan collection-distribution plan would tend to take away from the vestries and bishop's committees the incentive of providing for and paying adequate salaries to their clergy.

The report recommended a substitute plan called the Clergy Salary Fund Plan, which provided for a minimum salary equivalent to the one in the Basic Stipend Plan and a voluntary assessment levied by the clergy on their own salaries based on a sliding scale of 1 to 4 percent of their salaries to be paid into a clergy salary fund, which would be used to raise the salaries of the underpaid. Because this amount would not be enough to raise all the salaries of the underpaid to the minimum level, the laity would be given an opportunity to contribute to

the fund. Thus this report, if accepted, would mean the end of the Basic Stipend Plan.

However, I am happy to say that there also appeared a minority report made by one lone layman. This layman felt that differences of ability amongst the clergy should not be rewarded by differences in financial remuneration. He said that because of their consecration and devotion to follow their Master, no clergyman is now or should ever expect to be judged or rewarded by secular standards. Better ways of recognizing ability can be found. Under the present system, the salary of a clergyman is not necessarily any direct measure of his ability for Christian leadership. There is no justification for the extreme differences of compensation now existing within the clergy group when reasonable economic security has not been provided for all the members of the group.

The minority reporter pointed out three basic shortcoming in the majority report. The substitute plan does not equalize salaries nearly as much as the Basic Stipend Plan. Secondly, whereas the majority report implies that the incentive for the laity to raise money for salaries is largely personal interest in the welfare of the clergyman in their own parish, and that if they were asked to raise the same amount of money for salaries in other parishes the incentive would not be as great, the minority reporter believes from actual experience that this is not true. Thirdly, the clergy's voluntary assessment is so small that the lay contributions would have to make up over two thirds of the amount involved — and, of course, according to the majority report with lessened incentive.

The minority reporter then asked the crucial question:

> "Which of these plans is more in accord with the basic tenants of Christianity as we understand them?"

His hearers knew the answer to this question, rejected the majority report, dissolved the committee, and moved that no such committee be set up for another year. The majority had the last laugh, for they had succeeded in killing the action. Until this day there still exist in this diocese the same inequalities and burdens as in 1946.

The Diocese of Johannasburg provides a more encouraging case history. The Basic Stipend Plan has been an integral part of its life for over thirty years. The diocese has made phenomenal progress because it has been able to use its resources to the greatest advantage. The plan is now used throughout the whole Church of South Africa.

Here are some of the assets of the scheme as pointed out by the diocesan secretary last year. It makes it possible for clergy to go where they are most needed and best suited regardless of the location's financial ability. It destroys the unhappy situation of one priest living comfortably on a large income in a wealthy parish while his neighbor in the next town is forced to live on a mere pittance. It enables the minister to put before his people the Christian attitude on almsgiving without feeling he is begging for his own salary. It serves to illustrate the Christian principle of mutual aid. It makes possible the spiritual care of groups of the Church's people whose resources are small. It serves to emphasize once and for all that a priest is the servant of the Church and not solely the private servant of his congregation, thereby promoting a stronger world sense within the Church as a whole. Bishop Reeves, Bishop of Johannasburg, says:

> "I can only say that no one who has lived in a diocese where such a scheme is in

operation can ever feel content with the unequal, unjust, and unbrotherly method of paying the clergy as exists in other dioceses."

In conclusion, I would say that the Gospel's urgency requires us to make all haste to spread the Gospel message. We should do all in our power to remove any conditions which slow down our progress. The present system for supporting the clergy is such an obstacle. And it is within our power to remove it. Our lack of the feeling of urgency is conveyed to the laity and to the unchurched. Thus we make the task of the Holy Spirit more difficult by preventing ourselves from giving full service to God.

We spread the Gospel as much if not more by our behavior as by our preaching. We have the responsibility to act for the welfare of the whole Church. In this respect we have fallen far short of our mission.

Some Reflections on Bethel

By Rollin J. Fairbanks

Most of us can recall the amusing experience encountered at a carnival or some amusement resort, when we were confronted by full-length mirrors that produced extra-ordinary, distorted images. Perhaps in one we appeared as a compressed midget, in another we resembled the world's tallest man, while in a third we looked like a human washboard. In such situations we are startled, amused but not really disturbed because we know that the images are not real, the pictures we see aren t true, the persons we are looking at really dôn't exist.

An entirely different situation exists when we enter a clothing store and we are confronted with a full-length mirror that doesn't distort. This can and frequently does disturb us. What we see this time is what other people see of us. Very often the image which we encounter in the non-distorting mirror is not the same image we have in our minds about ourselves.

In fact one of the first things we usually do is to attempt to correct what we see. It may be simply buttoning our coat, straightening up, smoothing our hair, or even assuming a different position. Some times we just hurry out.

Let us now expand this experience into a multiple situation. Let us suppose we find ourselves in the center of a room which is completely lined with mirrors! And around this room is a gallery filled with people watching us. We quite naturally now feel even more threatened, less secure, more vulnerable, un-

It was into such a situation that I voluntarily placed myself last summer when I enrolled as a student with the National Training Laboratory for Group Development at Bethel, Maine. Although Episcopalians were predominant among the professional, religious workers, this group actually represented but a small fragment of the total student body. The latter was made up of educators, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, executives of foundations, Army and Navy and Air Force personnel, representatives of state and federal agencies, and many from industry including public relations officers, personnel men, training supervisors and executives. There were Jews, Roman Catholics, and Protestants. There were people from Sweden, England, Germany, Israel, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

Classes were small, usually made up of about fifteen people. The sessions were largely divided into training periods and practice periods. The former were unstructured, permissive and intensive. Within an incredibly short time a relatively free and natural relationship evolved. First names (often bestowed by the Church but seldom used within the Church) were invariably employed in all communication, whether one was a student or a member of the staff. Again and again I said to myself this is the way God intends us to live — honestly, actively and in real and close relationship with one another. Each of us was valued for himself. Rank and status on the outside were largely ignored. Often they proved to be handicaps in the process of being accepted by the group

One incident may serve to illustrate the kind of encounter which frequently occurs within such a group. I was attempting to interpret to my particular group why I believed one of the members was reacting the way she did. In my zeal to explain her behavior I temporarily was unaware of or insensitive to this woman's feelings. I failed to realize that my

contribution was being made at the expense of her personal comfort. A psychologist from New England college, whom I had come to know well, spoke up and said, "Rolly, you are dead right, but you certainly went about it in one hell of a way!"

It was a just rebuke, honestly shared and to the point. The significant thing about the observation was that it did not impair our relationship. It was acceptable, despite some inevitable discomfort on my part, because it was an honest judgment offered to help rather than hurt, and because it distinguished between unacceptable behavior and the person (John 8:11). My acceptance by the group was not jeopardized, and so since I felt little need to be defensive I was open to insight about myself, insight which will play an important part in all my future relationships with other persons and which would have been difficult to assimilate except in the context of the supportive group. Being a personal experience it is difficult to describe it adequately, but perhaps its value can be sensed.

The Kingdom, however, is not coming any sooner in Bethel than in Cambridge. There was a pathos, a tragic unreality — as well as warmth and nourishment — in the fraternization which took place especially outside of classes and in the evenings. Relationships were enjoyed, which often could not be continued in the "outside" world because of scarcity and non-accessibility of unattached, uncommitted (in a secular sense) people. But the Fellowship (and I deliberately capitalize the word) for which we faithfully pray and about which we glibly speak but which we too seldom actually experience within a church setting — this Fellowship was certainly at least approximated in the group

Those of us who have been privileged to be there can no longer deny that it can happen here. It can because it did, if only for a fleeting three weeks. Death and resurrection, guilt and redemption took on experimental meaning. There are amazing resources (as well as lessons) within the group. I am convinced that the Holy Spirit can and does produce through a group what is less likely if not improbable through the individual. An intensive group experience seriously challenges the perpetuating of the monarchical set-up of the traditional parish. It suggests, for instance, quite a different kind of vestry meeting.

The therapeutic value of the group experience is very real. It is one thing to be bounced off (to describe it aggressively) another person or to relate (to describe it more gently) to another person but it is a different experience to be bounced off or to relate to several persons at the same time and in the same setting. Within the group one can learn at first-hand both his strengths and weaknesses. Hence he can achieve greater insight into himself and his relationships with others.

The whole movement, however valuable, is probably destined to suffer somewhat at the hands of zealots — and your writer may unconsciously be Exhibit A. But those less eager, more secure, possibly in less need, should not abstain from such strengths and insights as it can provide.

A Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor,

I took this evening to re-read the third issue of the Journal. It sets my mind going in so many directions that I don't know where to begin or how to condense what I have to say. But I'll begin with the article on Field Work because, if what the poll says is true (and I expect it is), it seems as if the discontent could and should be remedied as soon as possible.

Flanders is right in saying that the solution lies in a clearer understanding between the rectors, the seminarians and the seminary itself in relation to what is expected of the students in their field work and what experience they will receive in return. What are some of the things which need to be more clearly understood? Are these among them?

1. That the clergyman has too little time to give on Sundays and the student has too little time to give on weekdays.

2. That the kind of work which will prepare a man for "full parish responsibilities" is the kind that is least possible for a rector to delegate. This is partly because the student is inexperienced, and partly because the relationship between parishioners and rector leads them to demand their rector at these times. Pastoral counselling takes considerably more time than the student can give and occurs at unexpected times. You cannot predict that sorrow, need, sickness or any other adversity will happen on Sunday or Wednesday. Another reason is that personal crises involve sympathy

and an emotional factor which does not mix well with studies in Cambridge.

3. That the help which a minister needs (and feels justified in paying for) is not as apt to be help with the essentials of his ministry (preaching, conducting services, and personal contacts with the members of his parish) as it is the kind of help which will free him to do these things. For most of us it is a constant struggle to find time for them amid the mass of details such as, Who is going to see that the servers do their job? Who is getting the coffee for the coffee hour? Who is getting the projector set up for Mr. S's class? Who is getting the transportation for the young people in the evening? How is the speaker getting here? and so forth.

4. That while, from the student's point of view, the $5, $10, or $15 seems little enough for the time spent, the minister is weighing what the student accomplishes with what he might obtain in volunteer help which costs nothing, or what he could do himself. If the student can do something (and do it well enough so that the minister does not later have to take care of a backwash and pick up the pieces) which enables the minister to be absent (taking an 11 o'clock session of the Sunday School, or a Y.P.F.), this is the most actual help. If the rector has to be present anyway (such as taking part of the regular morning service) it is no great help at all. Moreover, if the student is to learn, there should be occasions when he and the rector can talk at some length. This takes time. The rector should be, and usually is, glad to do it if a convenient time can be arranged, but it takes time and the student must realize that if his own time is valuable, so is the rector's. Perhaps he should mentally add to his remuneration the time which the rector gives him.

5. In the matter of preaching it is hard in

the ordinary parish to give the student the chance to preach once a month or once every six weeks as suggested. Congregations generally expect their rectors to preach at least three times a month. Unless there is an evening service this leaves only about one Sunday per month for a visiting preacher. Sometimes this will be a missionary (every parish should have missionary preachers two or three times a year); sometimes it will be a former rector or assistant or candidate; sometimes a cantata or musical service; and once a year the bishop for confirmation. Congregations are glad to hear students once or twice a year. Beyond that their welcome as preachers depends entirely on their real ability, and it is hard to get the congregation to understand that the student must have experience.

6. To make field work operate as it should, both clergy and students must, in all probability, be prepared to give more time voluntarily than they have. It will be a sacrifice on the part of both for the sake of the ministry. The student must think less about the time he is giving in return for the remuneration he receives; the minister must think less about the help he is getting for the money he pays.

Now to go over these points again constructively:

1. To take a Sunday School Class or run a Y.P.F. and give only the hours necessary for the meeting is a very limited experience. If a man can get a group of teen agers to want a program which is more than a good time, he is doing well. But the real interest in a Y.P.F. is not the meetings, but the individuals. That

is what makes it so difficult to do the job on a time schedule. To do a decent job with either Sunday School or Y.P.F. requires at least an afternoon or an evening a week in the parish outside the regular meetings. If this time can be given, the class or the group becomes a channel to a more rounded parish experience. In his group a man may find representation of 20 or 25 families. If he selects 15 and calls once a month he will find, in talking with the parents and seeing the homes, the problems which the kids are really facing. He will find in the homes the problems of sickness, old age, indifference, alcoholism, unhappy marriages, debt, and the opportunity for every kind of pastoral experience.

As the year progresses a new baby may arrive in one family. The student will find himself a natural part of the baptism and perhaps a sponsor or instructing some young person to be a sponsor. When death occurs he will be asked quite naturally to take part in the service and will be in a position to bring consolation to the family. When a crisis occurs he may find himself helping an alcoholic parent, or carrying some young person through an unhappy love affair. These are pastoral experiences.

More important than meetings themselves will be the casual conversations before the meetings, when some come early (probably the lonely ones) and some stay late (the most interested). There will be conversations in the corridor, on the street corner, in the drug store, at someone's home, and, if several are engaged in them, these will be the real chances for "group dynamics," when barriers are down and people are off guard. With individuals these are the times when confessions come out such as those mentioned in David Flanders' article in the Journal.

Sometimes the time spent will not be calling,

but attending meetings of the societies. People turn to a student as they come to feel he is a part of the parish. They expect him to have part in the Fair and spend most of the day there. They expect him at the parish supper and annual meeting (usually just before mid-years.) They like to see him on Christmas and Easter, though this is often impossible. At a Couples' Club meeting he will probably have good talks with five or six parents or Church School teachers. If they give him a chance to speak at these meetings he should take it and choose a subject which will help them to know him.

This extra time is essential. It is the only way to get the experience a man wants. In a parish you have to win your way into this experience. It can not be assigned.

2. As for taking part in services, a man should have a right to know at the beginning of the year how much he can expect. Every parish will differ. Some will already have clerical assistance and find it hard to work a third person into the morning service. Some will have evening services. Some will have mid-week Lenten Services and some will have Bible Classes instead. Some rectors will want help with confirmation classes, but some will feel it is their only chance to get to know the young people on this level and want to use it to build a relationship which can continue. Here again what the man can do depends on his own ability, his facility in talking to children, his preaching, his tact and sympathy.

The best practice for peaching is often obtained by giving simple talks on secular subjects. When a man's public speaking is limited to sermons he is apt to fall into pious phraseology and give after-dinner talks and

address secular groups. He should know how. Could not the students set up a speakers' bureau, providing speakers on various topics, hobbies, special interests, ready-prepared talks on "Why I went into the Ministry," "What happens in a Theological School?" talks on history, Bible, sports, travel, science, art, and music? These would be very good for exchange programs in Y.P.F.'s, but also very good for many older parish groups, or outside groups; and fully as valuable experience in sermon preparation as a sermon from the pulpit.

3. Finally, I do most heartily agree that a conference, or series of conferences between students doing field work and clergy and the school authorities would be very valuable, and would help greatly toward clearing up misunderstandings, and bringing out what each wants and each can give. Such a conference would not only help to solve the problem, but would be a find form of training and instruction in itself and the clergy would probably learn as much from each other as they would from the students and vice versa.

The question of the diaconate, of summer training and everything else relates to this problem. Flanders' article and writing my reply makes me realize very definitely that I should do more than I do and that all of us could do a lot that has not yet been done to remedy the situation.

Sincerely,

Fred Lawrence
Rector, St. Paul's, Brookline